Exhibit 14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

NESTLE PURINA PETCARE COMPANY,)

Plaintiff,)

v.) No 4:14-CV-859 RWS

BLUE BUFFALO COMPANY, LTD.,)

Defendant.)

MOTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY W. SIPPEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
OCTOBER 22, 2014

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: Richard M. Assmus, Esq.

MAYER BROWN LLP 71 S. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606

David A. Roodman, Esq. Emma C. Harty, Esq.

BRYAN CAVE LLP

211 North Broadway, Suite 3600

St. Louis, MO 63102

For Defendant: Steven A. Zalesin, Esq.

Adeel A. Mangi, Esq. PATTERSON AND BELKNAP

1133 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

(Appearances continued on Page 2)

REPORTED BY: SHANNON L. WHITE, RMR, CRR, CSR, CCR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

111 South Tenth Street, Third Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102

(314) 244-7966

PRODUCED BY COURT REPORTER COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

be at issue. Purina has in a number of ways in its complaint put their nutrient profile and their full formulation at issue.

THE COURT: Let's talk about LifeSource bits, and then we'll come back to the --

MR. MANGI: Sure. Your Honor, with regard to
LifeSource bits, let's be clear about what it is we're talking
about here. In the dog food there is — there are two parts.
One is kibble, which are the various pieces, and then there
are particular dark—colored bits that are mixed in there that
are the LifeSource bits. These contain particular nutrients.

Now, what they have alleged is that: You say you include certain nutrients in the bit, like lycopene or taurine, and that those nutrients have a particular health benefit associated with them. It's good for the pets' eyes, for example, things like that.

And we're saying, okay, if that's your allegation, we'll give you documents about the nutrient profile and the bits going to your claim that those nutrients that are in there don't have particular benefits that you say they do. And our General Objection 8, which is what is at issue here, expressly says we'll give them the documents about the nutrient profile.

So what they're seeking to do is take what is not the tail on the dog, Your Honor, it's the flea on the tail of the

dog, and say that I'm going to stretch this to cover your entire product range, and every one of the dozens of ingredients that go in there I want to know about every nutrient and every vitamin and every mineral.

This is absolutely nothing to do with the very, very narrow allegation about bits. That is essentially an afterthought in their complaint, which is focused on the by-product meal issue.

Then if I may return a moment to the preservative issue, we've heard many repetitions today, Your Honor, of the term "fishing expedition." Well, this is the absolute definition of a fishing expedition. And my friend, Mr.

Assmus, basically admitted it by reading to you these sections from the complaint, paragraphs 35 to 37, because all they say is: You say you have no artificial preservatives. That's not true because you have by-product meal.

And what he says is, well, you know, we included in there this little phrase "among other things," and because we were clever enough to include that phrase, now every ingredient in every product that you sell is fair game.

There is no particularized allegation about that.

They have made no specific claim. They have no basis for any claim about any other ingredient.

So this is the definition of trying to get beyond what they've alleged. And the words "among other things,"

Your Honor, in our view, are far too slim of a read on which to hang discovery that potentially dwarfs anything about by-product meal because they want every document at the company about every ingredient.

MR. ASSMUS: Two things, Your Honor. With respect to the LifeSource bits, the LifeSource bits claims are pervasive in Blue Buffalo's advertising. All their dry dog food has these LifeSource bits. And so what we're asking for, based on the claims that we're challenging with respect to the LifeSource bits, is to know what they want their co-packers to put in those LifeSource bits so that we can assess their nutritional content.

They claim those LifeSource bits give superior nutrition. They claim those LifeSource bits have certain levels of vitamins and minerals, and they further claim that that leads to health benefits for pets.

THE COURT: He told you they're going to provide you the nutrition panel -- or what the exact word was -- for LifeSource bits.

MR. MANGI: Yes, Your Honor. It's the nutrient profile. And that's the language we've used from the start in the general objection that's at issue here.

THE COURT: I'm condemning me and you to getting together on a frequent basis, but they're going to produce that information, and you'll see what we have.

Likewise, as I was listening, the more persuasive thing to me was you've alleged that there's preservatives, and you identify the chicken by-product meal as the source of those preservatives, and so we're going to limit the scope of that "ask" to the pleadings in the -- as pled.

If you have other information, I mean -- just by doing that, you can't open up the whole world by saying there might be preservatives somewhere else. I mean, one of the hard parts is the Twombly and Iqbal issue, and I -- but we're just not going to go from zero to a hundred miles an hour.

We're going to see where it takes us. And we're going to take it in phases. If it explodes on us, it explodes on us. If it's contained, it stays contained. But this case has the potential to spiral out of control if we don't take it in stages and steps.

That means we get to get together more often than most cases, but that's what we're going to do, and we'll see where we are. So granted in part and denied in part --

MR. ASSMUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- based on the focus on the chicken by-product meal.

What else do we need to talk about today? We have some issues we can't reach because we are missing a lawyer, right?

MR. ZALESIN: Yes, Your Honor. We agreed, the